U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PUBLIC MEETING

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had on October 26, 1994 at the Granite City Township Hall, Granite City, Illinois.

* * * * * * *

MS. PASTOR: Good evening. We're going to get started. So if everyone is seated, and has places maybe -- It is seven o'clock. Let's get started. My name is Sue Pastor. I'm the community relations coordinator for the project, the ML Industries/Taracorp Superfund project. Next to me is Brad Bradley, and he is what we call the remedial project manager. I think he is a familiar face to a lot of you. And next to him is Pat VanLeeuwen. Pat is a toxicologist with U.S. EPA. She has quite a bit of experience with lead issues and lead studies. And

I think between their presentations, they might answer any questions you might have. Hopefully, we'll be able to clear some things up for you.

I hope all of you picked up an agenda and the fact sheets that we have at the door. We really want to try to stick to the agenda. So if you could hold your comments until the end, and just bear with us, it won't take too long, and we will answer your questions and stay as long as we need to. And then if you also notice at the bottom of that, there is a portion that says public comments, and that's a little different than questions. And at that time, what we will need you do to is, if you have a statement, or an opinion, or a thought pertaining to the cleanup level that we're discussing, the 500 parts per million cleanup level, or really anything else that is going on in relation to the project here, that would be the time to make a statement for the official record. If you don't have a statement prepared, or if you don't like to speak in front of a group, in the fact sheet that you picked up, or got in the mail, there is a sheet in there where you can write your comment down, and you can do that, too, if you like, and you can hand it to me, or to just about any one of us with our

name tags on. We will also make that part of the record. If you like, you can think about it and send it to us. That would be okay, too. It's pretty much self-explanatory, and we will get that, and it will be an official record that way.

The comment period in the fact sheet says that it goes through November 14, but we have a request for an extension. So that will be until December 14. You have lots of time to think it over and get your comments in.

The fact sheet, hopefully, will summarize the information that we have. We have volumes of information that's at the Granite City Public Library. So if you really would like to read up on the studies, and all the documents that are generated in relation to this project, you're more than welcome to go there. We were at the library trying to get it reorganized. People look at it, and sometimes get it mixed up. We do our best to keep up with it. So if something is not there, if you notice in the course of the weeks, days, or months that something is missing that you'd like to see, please give us a call. We will replace it right away. Some times things get untidy, or misplaced. We like to keep it updated. We will be

able to replace that, if you tell us that something is missing.

What else? I think, at this point, we will have Brad come up and he'll talk a little bit about the site, the history. A lot of you probably know a lot about that; probably too much. If you don't know, or if you're unfamiliar with the background, he will go into that a little, and talk about the proposed plan, and then we will be seeking comments. Pat will talk about that cleanup level, and explain a little bit of how we arrived at certain numbers and levels. And then we will take your questions. And then if you have comments for the comment portion, the court reporter is sitting in the corner. She is taking down everything that is happening tonight, all of the questions, all the comments, all of the presentations. And that transcript will be part of the official record that will also be in the library when it's completed. So when it comes time for the comment portion of the meeting, if you could step up to the microphone and state your name clearly for her, and if it's a name that needs to be spelled, we'd appreciate that, too. So that will come later on in the meeting. That's it

for right now. I'll turn it over to Brad.

MR. BRADLEY: I'll run through this briefly so you can get to the questions fairly quick.

The ML Industries/Taracorp Superfund site is located in Granite City, Madison, Venice, Eagle Park Acres, and even some other surrounding communities. The main industrial area is located at 19th and Cleveland, roughly. And the industry that ML Industries and Taracorp engaged in was secondary lead smelting. And what has resulted from those operations is contamination of surrounding areas through several ways. One of them is the air, through the air. The smelter stack released lead through the air, which settled into surrounding yards, and has contaminated them over levels which we feel are a health threat. There is also a Taracorp pile, a large 65,000 cubic yard slag pile that is a by-product of the operation, which sits on the main industrial area, and may have involved also contributing dust levels of lead. And there is also a lot of fill material, which is why Venice and Eagle Park Acres are also locations where the site has impacted.

For a brief period of time, in the late '50's and early '60's, ML Industries advertised free

fill from the pile, and this was in the form of crushed, hard rubber battery case material, which was taken to many locations and used to fill in potholes, resurface alleys. And also, in the case of Eagle Park, primarily just to fill in low areas that were a flood problem.

And lastly, and this is something that we discovered in late 1992, but the Taracorp pile has also contaminated ground water with lead levels that are well in excess of federal and state standards for lead. The EPA issued a Record of Decision in March of 1990, which described remedies for all these methods of contamination I've described, except ground water, because we didn't know at that point that that was contaminated.

What we are here to talk about today is the residential soil cleanup level. Let me just briefly mention what we've done since 1990 is we've cleaned up about 20 to 30 alleys in Venice, and quite a few locations in Eagle Park Acres where battery case material was located with the higher lead concentration. Some of those were up to about 100,000 parts per million. We've remediated most, if not all, of the very higher, or highly contaminated battery

case fill areas. There were also a few in Granite City, but they were very -- just isolated events. I think there was only one within the City limits, also a few in Granite City. We've also found that material as far out as Glen Carbon. But again, that's not too many of those. We haven't remediated any of those, yet. And we've also, starting late last year, we've remediated about 30 residential yards that were impacted by the smelter stack emissions. And at this point in time, we're continuing on with 17 more. And most of our work is currently focused in the 1400 block of Grand, 1400 block of State, and the odd side of the 1400 block of Madison.

And that sort of leads into another point, which is we've -- The EPA has agreed to open this -- open the record and accept further public comments on the residential soil cleanup level through an agreement reached in court. And that is really what we are here to do today, to explain why we arrived at the cleanup level that we were proposing, and also to receive comments on that. But if anybody has comments on the pile, or ground water, or any of the battery case material fill areas, we'd be glad to hear those, too.

Just to give you an idea of the scope, if you haven't seen a map like this before, this doesn't include Glen Carbon, but the areas that are shaded in pink and red are the areas which are impacted by the smelter stack emissions over 500 parts per million of lead. And the purple areas are the areas where the remote fill was taken. This is Venice, and this is Eagle Park Acres. And the green area in the center is the main industrial area where Taracorp currently operates. It also includes BV&G Transport, and a trust property.

The EPA reviewed the information, both historically, and also that which was -- which has been produced since the signing of the 1990 Record of Decision, and also followed the guidelines that was recently issued with regard to soil lead cleanup levels for residential areas. And what we are recommending is that we basically stick with the 500 parts per million cleanup level for lead in residential soil, and I'll let Pat go into that in much greater detail.

And for the final part of what I am going to present, I'd just like to let you know where we are going with all of this. We had not forgotten about

reevaluating the recommendation for the Taracorp pile, or the ground water, or the remaining battery case material fill areas. What we will do is, after we complete some pilot studies which are necessary for us to get reliable cost estimates, and also gauge the success of whether or not we can remove the Taracorp pile without creating unacceptable dust levels of lead, we will then propose a recommendation for the Taracorp pile, the ground water, and also the remaining battery case material areas.

The reasons we are reevaluating these particular areas are that when we found the ground water contamination in late 1992, then that made us want to reevaluate whether or not capping the pile as we currently have in the 1990 Record of Decision was still appropriate, considering now that we have the ground water contamination. It's rather obvious why we now have the ground water to think about, because we didn't know that before. Now, we need to figure out what we can do to deal with the ground water contamination.

The battery case material fill areas, what changed there, was back when ML Industries did the initial studies in 1985 through 1986, they only

located about four or five areas that had this battery case material that we will need to clean up. After a brief tour of these areas right before we signed the Record of Decision, EPA determined that there certainly were a lot more than that. We estimated about 16. When we actually got down into Venice and into Eagle Park Acres, and began to cleanup these areas, a lot of the neighbors came by and said, 'By the way, we also have this.' We checked them out. Now we have over 70 locations. So what we are doing is reevaluating. With respect to the battery case material areas, do we continue to fully remove the contamination, knowing that it's going to be extremely costly, and certainly a lot more than we predicted back in 1990, or do we remove some of it, whether it's a yard, and possibly pave over some of the paving uses, such as driveways, and alleys, or parking lots. And the reason that we are considering that, at this point, is not only because of the greater numbers, but we have, at this point, cleaned up the most highly contaminated battery case material areas. So it may be appropriate to consider a different remedy for those that remain.

And that's basically all for my talk. I

will turn it over to Pat, and she'll explain basically how we got to the 500 parts per million cleanup level we're recommending here.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: When we went to reevaluate the soil cleanup level for NL Industries/ Taracorp, we used three different pieces of information. One, we reviewed a lot more information, a lot more literature, newer literature on health effects of lead in children. We looked at cleanups that had been done in other places where they worked. And we assembled a new Administrative Record, which you are welcome to go to the library and look at it, and see what it says. I think there is a lot of the information there, and you might find something that interests you, if you just go down and look at what is in those boxes.

The second thing we looked at was the health study by the Illinois Department of Public Health, and what that said, and U.S. EPA has made their comments on that study, and the health study is also in the repository, and our comment on the health studies are also in the repository. But I am not going to talk about that this evening, because we don't do that study. That was done by the Illinois

Department of Public Health. I think you have heard about it before.

The very thing we did was used a model, a biokinetic model, which you may have heard about, to look at the potential to lead poisons in children in the area. I will talk about that a little bit.

First of all, I'd like to start out with a little background on the health risks. So you know, we evaluate the potential for an adverse health effect by measuring the blood level of lead in children. And we do that because the blood level goes up quite rapidly after children have been exposed for a few months, and also because it's the most widely used index of the amount of lead that is in a child's body. Now, there are a lot of other things you can measure. You can measure lead in bone, lead in hair, lead in teeth. But we really don't know how those things are associated with the health effects. So the health effects have been shown to be associated with blood lead levels in children are that 10 micrograms per decaliter, or above ten micrograms per decaliter. That is just a unit of the lead in a certain amount of the blood. This is a level that's been determined by medical doctors all over this country, all over the

world, research workers in the health field, and that has been documented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, by the Center for Disease Controls, as a number we should aim to get to in children to protect children above that level. The chance that children will have blood lead levels greater than 10 is of concern to risk assessors. I am a risk assessor/toxicologist. And so that's the value that I use to determine whether there is going to be a problem, or adverse health effect problem in children.

Now, EPA has a tool which they developed. It's called Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic model for lead in children. It's a mouthful. We abbreviate it to IEUB model. It works on a personal computer. And this is the tool that risk assessors use to build a picture of what the exposure is in children, and the areas, and how that -- what that level might mean in terms of health effects. And the levels that we look at don't apply to real children. This is a hypothetical model. It applies to hypothetical children, because it relates to what a child might do, not what a child actually has done.

When we do blood lead measurements, we are measuring what a child's actual exposure has been.

But if a child goes to a day care center, and the child hasn't played in the back yard the whole time, and there are a lot of things that affect how much lead exposure a child may have gotten. This model looks at what a child might get.

The model has four components, as you can tell by the name. The I stands for integrated. What we actually do is plug in the model, or all the actual exposure variables, and that's the concentration in the air, the water samples that were taken, the dust samples, the soil samples. We look at the amount of the lead in the diet, and we look at the amount of food that a child can eat. The model looks at children from age zero through the sixth year of life, and the model has values for the amount of the food children eat at each year of life, the amount of air they breathe, and et cetera.

The Uptake section is the amount that actually gets into the blood after it's been taken into the system, either by eating soil, or breathing the dust, or drinking the water that has lead.

The Biokinetic portion talks about the movement of the lead in the body once it's gotten into the blood stream, how it gets into the body, and how

it's eliminated.

And the last portion of the model has some statistical programs built into it so that we can do something with the data once we've collected it.

This is just a little pictoral diagram of what I just said. The blue ovals are the source of lead in the environment. We are concerned mostly at EPA with the environmental sources, because those are the sources we can do something about. So when I run the model, I usually do not include paint. I include the environmental sources. So, if I see that a child has a lead problem from the environmental sources, we would add a point for those. You may -- The lead gets into the body through the lungs, and with the stomach, and goes into the blood stream. It moves around in the body. You will notice there are two bone depths, and those are deep bone and surface bone, which is just a unit for which we check. We look at how the lead is eliminated in urine, sweat, skin, hair, and feces.

The model can be applied in a number of different ways, and the interpretation and the kind of results you get depends on where you use the model. The model is used to look at an area. We define an

area as an area that would be appropriate for cleanup decisions, such as an individual residential yard. And it's appropriate for us to look at exposure in that way, because most children are exposed in their own yard, their own home as the primary exposure.

Again, this is picture of what I said. I think I'll show part of it, and then I'll move it so you can see it easier. We can look at the exposure to a single hypothetical child, and put in actual data for soil lead levels, dust lead levels, the amount of lead in the water. And what we do is we don't get a single number that predicts what a child's blood lead level would be. We get what we call a probability distribution, and it's this little curve over here. What it means is that there is a chance, if this is it, if the blood lead goes from a low level to a high level, there is a chance that the blood lead level can be either low or high, but most likely it will be in the center where the curve is the highest. We can look at a number of children living in the same house and/or an amount where we have a lot of the children, or children of a number of different ages living in the same location. And we will get a curve for each one of the children, and that curve will be different

for each child, because each child has its own individual behavior, as does each of your children grow at different rates, gain weight at different rates. Every person is an individual who behaves slightly differently. We can look at a lot of children in a neighborhood, and we will get a curve for each child that's slightly different. We can use the model to look at different neighborhoods, for example, Venice and Granite City. And if we combine them all, we factor the values that we get here, and combine it with the values there. We might look at a number for an area for the whole community.

Now, once we've got all of those little curves, it looks something like this. On the computer you get a lot of the curves. We try to put them together, put them into one curve. There are a lot of different variables that we can store in this model. And we'll show you what happens when we do some of that.

This graph shows how that curve -- Say we are doing this for an individual child, and we assume that the soil lead level is a 500, and it changed the dust lead from zero to 1,500. See how the shape of the curve would change. So if it was only lead in the

soil and not in dust, you have might have a curve that looks like this top one. And then as more of the dust and soil lead change, there was more lead in the dust than in the soil, the curve would flatten out more. So you could get a series of curves just looking at the same soil lead level and different dust levels. That is now the children can have different shaped curves.

When we have that data, we can do different things with that. We can put it back into the computer, and we can have the computer look at the predicted blood lead versus the number of children that we counted, and we can take -- If this is 10 micorgrams per decaliter -- Does that work? Yeah. We can look at how many kids are above the 10. We can have the computer count them so that we actually get a number. And we look at the amount that are over 15, or the number of kids that are over 20. And, of course, these kids would be given into the range where they might have to have medical intervention. And that was based on real data.

And one of the questions you may ask is: Does the model work? How good is it? This graph shows us that the little diamonds that are pointed up

are the predicted ones; the ones that we model. And the ones that are pointing down are the ones that are observed. And those came from the blood lead study the Illinois Department of Health did. You will notice that those curves look like this. We think the model does work pretty well. Especially at this site, it seems to have worked pretty well.

Now, one of the things we did with this model, I said we can vary some of the parameters. One of things we've noticed is that the amount of lead that is tracked into the house gets into the house, and dust IS spread in the different areas around Granite City and Venice. Now, the data that we had did not have any exact addresses. What we knew was how far a particular location, a data point that we were given, was from the NL/Taracorp site, but we didn't know what the particular address was. So we had to just look at -- I think the original report WAS four concentric rings. We tried to break that down into 10 different ones. Some of that got processed that way. We noticed that the amount of lead in the house dust to the amount of lead in the soil dust varied. And so we used different numbers. This would be the average across the whole site. The model would

have said, if we did not use site specific data at all, just ran the model and used the default value, we would have used this value in doing our calculations to try to determine what the lead cleanup level should be in the soil. Using the default would have indicated maybe we should clean the lead, the soil, all the way down to 340 parts per million. By looking at the actual data in and around Granite City, we found that, as we looked closely, there were different areas that had different ratios of the soil to the house dust, and that would indicate that probably a cleanup in the range or about 400 to 500 would be appropriate. And the average would be probably somewhere between 450 and 500. We think that because this is hypothoetical, and we've done some modeling, that this might be a good range to look at for a soil cleanup level.

I think, at this point, I'll just turn it back to Sue. She can ask for questions.

MS. PASTOR: If we can get the lights turned up here. We'll wait for those lights to be turned on. I want to remind everyone about the sign-in sheet, if you didn't do that when you came in. That will put you on our mailing list. If you aren't

already on our mailing list, and didn't get our fact sheet in the mail, you can pick it up tonight, and then you will be able to get all future mailings in the future. That doesn't mean that we are going to flood you with a lot of the junk mail, but every so often, once a year or so, maybe every six months or so, we like to put out a letter or newsletter, and make sure people who want to get our mailings will get them. If you know anybody who needs to be on the mailing list and couldn't make it tonight, call me. We have the 800 number on here. In fact, if you have any questions, or thoughts, or any reason to ask a question, you can call me, Brad, Pat, any of us on the 800 number and ask us any time. So if you are wondering what is going on, and just wanted to call and ask a question, we're available to answer those questions. We have voice mail. If you get the voice mail, please leave a message, and we will return the calls. We do travel a lot. We're here tonight to be with you, so we do check the voice mail, and we will call you back.

And another thing, I just wanted to mention, too, that I didn't mention earlier, when you make your comments and stuff, a little bit about all

or that. The comments we respond to in our document responsiveness summary. So that will be attached to our final document outline, the decision here, and that will also be included in the repository over at the library. So if you have a question, perhaps you could come up to the microphone, and the court reporter will be able to hear you better. This is a very large room. I think that probably would work out best. So I'd like you to come up and raise your hands or something, and we will try to answer your questions.

MR. TARPOFF: Included in the original Record or Decision was something we didn't have an opportunity to comment on, and that was the running of the biokinetic model. It was a different model at the time, and there was some gross errors made in the running. The default values were inaccurate, et cetera. In the library, is there included in the new material there all of the values that you have used, all of the sums that you have used in running the model?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I think, you know, when we ran the original model, I am not certain that we ran it incorrectly. I think, Craig, what we did was

used the default, and we didn't have that database. We didn't have what we have now from this last set of the samplings to do something more indepth. And I think now having a database that has a lot more information, we feel it's more appropriate to look at things like the movement of lead from the soil into the house dust. The model has now been run by Allen Marcus, a statistician with U.S. EPA, and a researcher from North Carolina, who was one of the developers of the model. And so he is quite knowledgeable about running it. He submitted, and its one of the last entries, about the third to last entry in the report, his preliminary assessment of the data. And what you can see is he was really doing a sensitivity analysis, which I tried to present to the soil cleanup level. Because the thing that we saw that was changing was the soil to cleanup soil to house dust.

MR. TARPOFF: I reviewed that. There are no values that he used in the running or the model with regard to the model run in 1990. The problems that we saw in it were in the defaults, specifically the --

MS. PASTOR: That works better when it's turned on.

MR. TARPOFF: Specifically, the dietary values. The dietary values used in the 1990 running of the model from 1992, they were three times higher than the dietary values that existed in 1990. That's when I stated it was done improperly, that's the basis on that. I have a couple others.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Can I answer that one before you go on?

MR. TARPOFF: Sure.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: The administrative record also includes a new guidance manual for running the new model, and it includes all of the default values. And you will be happy to see that the new dietary data from the latest study is now a default in the model. That's what is being used. So we were using a much lower dietary value than we did previously.

MR. TARPOFF: The model -- Is Dr. Allen Marcus's report in the library, and all of the values he used?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Well, I am not certain what you mean by all the values he used. When we use it to generate a soil cleanup level, we look at the data to see whether there is any justification for

changing any of the defaults. Okay. And the default that was changed was the soil to the house dust number, and that's -- we ran sensitivity analysis on it, and that's what gave us the table that I referred to. And that table is in his report.

MR. TARPOFF: Okay. Does the new model use soils, bare soils only, or is there a fusion or grass covering input in the model, or is it basically considering bare soil only?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: The model credits that a child eats 200 milligrams a day of soil as an average. Actually, there is a different value for each year, from year zero to seven. It doesn't matter where a child gets that soil. Okay. It's just the ingested rate of soil.

MR. TARPOFF: Okay.

MR. BRADLEY: Just so you know, the Allen Marcus report that Pat mentioned, I think it's item number 112 in the Administrative Record. We think someone walked away with a copy of it. So we put it back in there. It should be in the boxes on the radiator at the repository. It should be located in that box.

MR. TARPOFF: The one that I saw had none

of the values that he used in the model; just has a very generic, 'I ran the model.'

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Using all the default values set forth, soil to dust ratio. I mean, obviously children don't eat -- You are asking me whether we consider whether the soil is covered with grass or not covered. If the soil is covered with grass, the child is going to get the soil on their hands, it's not going to be tracked into the house. It is the soil that we worry about that becomes bare with use.

One of things that I hear you saying is some of these yards have grass. I have been down here in years when it was very -- the grass -- People weren't able to water the grass, and the cover wasn't so good.

MR. TARPOFF: I am asking about the model, not specifically. I am asking about it because --

MS. VANLEEUWEN: We look at ingestion of soil.

MR. TARPOFF: The model was based on bare soil?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: It's based on ingestion

or soil.

MR. TARPOFF: Also, what values -- Are there values input in Granite City for paint, or is the default zero?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: We only looked at the lead burden based on environmental exposures, not paint. Realizing that if paint was included, that those values would be higher. Now, the way the indoor dust was generated there may be some contribution, because it's hard to separate out that value, the way that they did their indoor dust analysis. But in general, it's based on environmental exposure only.

MR. TARPOFF: One final question: What studies can you point us to that prove up the EPA's case that soil removals have statistical significant and meaningful results in lowering blood lead levels?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Well, I think we've had very dramatic demonstration recently in Kellog, Idaho. We had a two-tier removal plan where we were going to do soil removal, and if we didn't get the kids blood lead levels down we were going to continue the removal, and the state was going to work to remediate house paint as well. What happened was that after the soil was removed, the kids blood lead levels dropped

eight micrograms per deciliter. They have continued to stay down. This report has, I think, changed a lot of things about how hard it is to remove the lead in soil, and it was presented down at a conference in Australia, or a copy of that presentation was in the Administrative Record. I can't tell you what number it is, but it's the report from that conference.

MS. PASTOR: That's the feedback from the two microphones at the same time. Speak loudly, or else use the other mic. That would be helpful.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: This report has been reported at an international lead conference in Australia, I think, in May or June. That report is in there. I welcome you to look at it, because we've seen some very spectacular reductions in blood lead levels with soil removal.

MR. TARPOFF: Did they have similar soil levels to what we had?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: It was a smelter.

MR. TARPOFF: With levels similar to here, or were they much higher, tens of thousands?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: To tell you the truth, I have not seen that entire study. I just received it. We sent it on down. So I haven't had a chance to look

at it.

MR. TARPOFF: This was done in the last two years?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Yes.

MS. PASTOR: Okay. Someone else have a question for us? Yes.

MR. SELPH: Yes. I am not really clear. Maybe I misunderstood it. You said most of your lead exposure comes from the yard, I think. Is that what you said in the beginning?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I said that we try to consider that the basic unit of exposure is a child's yard and home, and, you know, this immediate surrounding area. We do have a provision in the lead model to include exposures at day care centers, or other areas, if we think that's a problem.

MR. SELPH: This is a series of questions. The next question I have is: How can you differentiate contamination of lead into the blood stream from the soil from the paint in the house? Because most of the houses, according to the map here, are in an area of probably over 60 years old that certainly lead based paint was a predominant factor in those homes. Those that weren't painted, or that are

chipping and so forth, are certainly exposing these children as well. How can you differentiate that from the lead in the blood, the lead from the paint, or the lead from the soil?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I can't differentiate the lead from lead in water, the lead in paint, or lead in soil, or lead in dust. It all becomes lead when it's in the blood, and once it's absorbed. However, when we did the model, we did not model the paint. So any predictions we have about how many children would be above 10 micrograms per decaliter were based on the fact that their exposure was confined to the environmental sources of lead. If we were to add paint in, the children should be given greater amounts of the lead.

MR. SELPH: How many children in that area of your study were over 10?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Well, if you want to go back to, I just happen to have pulled that, if you want to go back to the report that was done by the Illinois Department of Public Health, I think if you look at their data, they looked at about 409 kids. There were -- I don't have a total, exactly. In the first zone of the nine kids, 33 percent have blood

lead levels greater than 10.

MR. SELPH: I'm sorry. How many kids?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: 33 percent.

MR. SELPH: How many in numbers?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I'd have to go back and calculate that. See, I didn't do this. I just -- Dr. Allen Marcus has that database. He is the one that has pulled the numbers up. He is the one who --

MR. SELPH: You said how many children were tested?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: He broke this down into 10 zones. The first zone, there were nine children, 33.3 percent of them, which would be three out of nine, have blood lead levels greater than 10. In the second zone, 23 percent have blood lead levels greater than 9. The third zone, 25 percent; and in the fourth zone, 19 percent. In the fifth zone, 18 percent; the sixth zone, seven percent. So it's quite clear that the percentage of kids that have blood lead levels greater than 10 micrograms per decaliter --

MR. SELPH: It's kind of hard to tell. I wish I had real numbers of kids to get a better picture of it.

The last question I want to direct

towards Brad. Brad, it says in here, do you know when the smelter stopped operating? You know, I think it's a little misleading. On Page 3, it said lead from the residential, lead from the smelter, residential soil may enter homes in the form of lead dust. And I don't believe that lead smelter has been operating for at least 14 years.

MR. BRADLEY: Actually, it shut down in 1985. So, it's about 11 years. And I don't think -- We didn't give a time frame on that. This is historically.

MR. SELPH: I just want to clear it up. It does look as if the lead smelter is still operating, and still emitting dust. Of course, that may cause undue --

MR. BRADLEY: Taracorp is still operating.

MR. SELPH: But the smelter doesn't operate since that shut down. The air levels of lead have gone down gradually to where there is only a fraction of the standard that applies.

Also, do you know, what was the average lead? This is something maybe you now, and maybe you don't know. In the '60's, you know -- It's been

recommended now are above 10. What was it in the 1960's? Do you know that answer?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Well, I think --

MR. SELPH: Just use that figure, '60's, '50's?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I have seen some numbers. I think we did put something in the Administrative Record. It certainly was probaly around, I think, 12. So it might have been slightly higher. I don't know if that was an average. I think this sounds a little higher. I can't remember that much.

MR. SELPH: Thank you.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Maybe I could say one thing. Ten is not a magic number. As you know, at a blood level of 10, not everyone is going to have the same health effects. Some children may show effects at eight micrograms per decaliter. Other children won't have any health effects at 15, because there is a a great deal of mobility.

MS. PASTOR: Someone else?

MS. RISOENGER: My name is Chris Risoenger. It's my understanding that the 1400 block of State, Grand, and the odd side of Madison Avenue is

a pilot program, is that correct, to see how it effects -- how the EPA cleaning this up is going to affect the yards that have already been cleaned up in the neighborhoods surrounding. Is that correct or not?

MR. BRADLEY: That's not exactly correct, at least from the EPA's standpoint. I understand that the City is doing some studies along with the cleanup in that area. Speaking of those, from our standpoint, we want to clean up all of the yards, especially the ones that have the higher lead concentration. We don't see this as a pilot study. We intend to continue on after this is all done.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. Has EPA asked permission of the City to clean up easements on, especially on Grand Avenue, 1410, 1443, and 1442, that were not cleaned up when those yards were initially cleaned up?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. Actually, we asked verbally, and then put it in writing, and got a written response back.

MS. RISOENGER: What was the written response from the City of Granite City about cleaning up the easements in the 1400 block of Grand,

specifically 1410, 1440 and 1442?

MR. BRADLEY: They didn't really answer, you know, with specific street numbers or anything. They just said, "No, you cannot have access to clean up the easements." They gave a reason that when the Taracorp pile gets removed, that it will probably recontaminate those yards. That was the reason, but the answer was no.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. Then why are they allowing you to clean up the easements in the meantime on the yards currently being done in the 1400 block of State, Grand, and the odd side of Madison Avenue?

MR. BRADLEY: You will have to ask them that. I don't know. It's something we wanted to do all along. We didn't want to do 90 percent of the yard, and then leave everything. So, it's really their decision as to say no in the first place, and then also to allow it on the 17 yards that we are doing currently.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. If the EPA does find out that children in these areas are being, you know, that there is less children contaminated by the soil content than what was originally, you know, said, or what the original tests showed that they weren't,

if they find out the numbers drop, okay, in the areas that are currently being cleaned up, does it matter to EPA if only one child is being affected by the soil contamination in their yard, or if there is 500 children being affected by the soil contamination in their yard?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I think it's the EPA's policy to protect all generations of children. What we see is the properties turnover. New families move in. They have children. Some of these properties are becoming rental properties. People are moving in with children. We have no idea how many children will ultimately be affected by the one property that is not cleaned up.

MR. BRADLEY: Just to continue that, the amount Pat was talking about targets that we would have 95 percent of the children at a rate below 10 micrograms per decaliter blood lead levels. That's what that is based on.

MS. RISOENGER: So that model was based on -- So that model was based on when the Illinois EPA did the lead study on the children, and what -- Do you know that, offhand?

MR. BRADLEY: I think the numbers

pertain -- You're referring to the Illinois Department of Public Health?

MS. RISOENGER: Yeah. Sorry. The percentage you quoted for what that other question was?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Yeah. These percentages were from the study that they did. I believe they took samples in 1991. Environmental samples were taken. That's the environmental data that we used for the model, and the blood lead values, or the values that are normally accepted.

MS. RISOENGER: So that was the children living in those areas at the time, and those are the children that are still living in those areas, though when they were younger, also; right?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I guess they have to have lived in the area for at least three months to be eligible. It was a volunteer study. It wasn't all the children who lived in the area. It was a sampling. We assume that it applies to the others, like the children who weren't studied were similar.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. I have one more. The lawsuit that was filed against the EPA to stop this, was it filed by the City? Was it filed by NL

Industries? Was it filed by Taracorp? Who filed the lawsuit against the EPA to stop this?

MR. BRADLEY: The City of Granite City filed a temporary restraining order to stop the cleanup, which the EPA began on August 9, and then -- And that was also followed up by a hearing, which action then took place on September 20 and 21 for a preliminary injunction, which would have been a more permanent stoppage. But an agreement was reached that allowed EPA to clean up these yards we've been talking about, and the easement. And the City would do some studies. There were a few other details the City brought up.

MS. RISOENGER: You say the City of Granite City, though, is it your understanding they filed it on behalf of the citizens of Granite City; is that correct? Or do you not know that?

MR. BRADLEY: They may have done that, but I don't know.

MS. RISOENGER: I have to ask somebody from the City?

MR. BRADLEY: I don't know on whose behalf. They may have put that language in there.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BURGER: Franklin Burger is my name. I keep hearing a lot about the water systems and stuff like that. Are you periodically taking ground water samples in Granite City?

MR. BRADLEY: What we did was we placed these basically in a ring around the Taracorp pile, and as long as those wells weren't contaminated, we really didn't have any reason to put any further out. What we have found, though, in late '92 was they were contaminated. So at this point, one of the follow-ups we will have to do is try to see how far to the south-southwest of that pile this is migrating. We don't know that answer now. That's not the way the system was set up. It's something we will have to correct for. We will -- There are some lawn water wells -- I am aware of at least one -- that are in the south-southwest direction of the pile. And I think we will sample one of those very soon. And hopefully, that will provide us with some information. Eventually, we will have to put in more wells and determine how far this is migrating.

MR. BURGER: You say this is to the south?

MR. BRADLEY: The flow direction is

roughly south-southwest.

MR. BURGER: The first cleanup, to my knowledge, occurred to the north. That was out on old Route 67, Missouri Avenue?

MR. BRADLEY: What is it now?

MR. BURGER: What is now by A.O. Smith?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, see that is one of the battery chip fill areas. That was not impacted by the smelter stack emissions. That's not part of the 55 block area that was impacted by the smelter stack with 500 parts per million. And those particular residents had extremely high lead levels, higher than any that we found in these yards around the smelter, because of the battery chips. And one, we didn't have to start with them. We had alleys in Venice, and places in Eagle Park Acres that we were going to do, as well. But one good reason to start out there was to test the effectiveness of our dust control. If it was not effective, it would have been better to determine that out where no one was really impacted than to be in the middle of an alley in Venice, and find out our techniques weren't working. What we did find out is that the wetting of the area that we did during the cleanup was very effective. But that was

one of the reasons it drove us to start out there. So that was a remote location. And yes, there are people living there, and they did have children visit quite often. We did have an impact.

MR. BURGER: Another question I have, and I don't mean to be redundant. We keep hearing the word cleanup, or cleaning up; but even if you remove the soil from in front of this building, you pick it up and move it to the next block; you might have removed this lead to the next block, but have you ultimately cleaned it?

MR. BRADLEY: I guess I don't quite understand that. First of all, we're not moving it from block to block. We're taking it to a toxic land fill. But I guess I still don't understand.

MR. BURGER: The lead is still there; right?

MR. BRADLEY: No.

MR. BURGER: Where is it? Where is the lead at?

MR. BRADLEY: It's in the dirt that we were taking away.

MR. BURGER: Where are you taking it to?

MR. BRADLEY: To the land fill.

MR. BURGER: Then the lead is now in the land fill; right?

MR. BRADLEY: Right.

MR. BURGER: When it rains, it's going to go back into the ground water?

MR. BRADLEY: Actually not. The land fill regulations recently were changed so that anything you put in a land fill, certain waste, and this qualities, coming from a lead smelter, it has to pass a test called toxitity leaching procedure test to ascertain that it will not leach out unacceptable levels or, in this case, lead into the ground water. So for every yard so far that was impacted by the smelter stack emissions, they all pass the test without having to do anything to them. But the battery chip areas, they did not pass the test. In general, what we needed to do was mix those in with the cement-like material so that they could be received at the land till. The lead would not wash out with the next rain. So there is actually treatment methods described to avoid exactly what you are saying.

MR. BURGER: I will try once again. Maybe I am not too swift. I will try so simplify my

question. The lead is still lead; right? The lead is still there? It's over at the dump now? We've moved it from here to the next block, and to the -- I'm simplifying. My question is: Can you take the lead out of the soil?

MR. BRADLEY: It can probably be taken out of the soil, but it can't be destroyed. It's not like a solvent that you can simply burn it off, and that changes the chemical form. We can probably, just as they do with the leaching test, put a lot of the acid through the soil, and it will pick up a lot of the lead. I don't know if you can ever clean the soil entirely of lead. You can take some of that out, but that would be extremely costly, and really wouldn't get us anywhere. Because, like I said, what we are talking about is the basic land fill requirements anyway. This lead that we are dealing with in the residential yards impacted by the stack emissions, the reason we are cleaning it up is not to prevent ground water contamination, it's to prevent children getting into it directly, and getting it into their stomach by their hand-to-mouth activities. It's really not aimed at ground water avenues.

MR. BURGER: I think you have answered my

question when you said, no, you are not removing the lead. Thank you, sir.

MR. WILSON: My name is Paul Wilson, and I live in the 1700 block of Edison. My daughter lives there in another house, and my son lives in another house, and I want my yards cleaned up. I completely don't even want to discuss how I feel about the way Granite City has treated my family, my grandchildren, and myself thinking I am so stupid that they want to come up -- If one child gets infected with lead, that is enough to clean the whole neighborhood. If they don't understand, let them move down there. They don't live down there like I do. I'm tired of all of this baloney going on. All I want them to do is let the Environmental Protection Agency, which is my government, come in and clean up the mess that they let years ago happen in the first place. Because 20 years ago, they didn't care about nothing but money. And now it's the same thing. All I want is a clean yard for my granddaughters, and a clean yard for the animals. And I don't want to hear nothing else about ten percent of this, ten percent of that, a high volume of this lead level contamination. If you have got one child that is going to get contaminated, then

it all should be cleaned up. We just spent $200 billion to send food and money to Haiti, and then they can't clean up my yard? Somebody needs replacing, or needs to get back and take a real good look at themselves, and see what they are doing to me and my neighborhood, my country, and my city. Because I think it's really silly for them to be debating something that should have already been done. There was no reason for them to stop it in the first place. If there is, I sure would like to know what it is. Because nobody has to ask me if they don't want it done. In 1980 I wanted my yard cleaned up. When EPA first started, I said I have been waiting for it ever since. I finally get a chance to get it done, and Granite City says no. I think Granite City better wake up and say yes, and start minding the business of the people who is putting them in office, because I really am just tired of it. I'm tired of seeing kids being poisoned by our City. If they are going to be poisoned, at least let's do something to try to prevent it; not help it. And as far as yard cleanup is concerned, it's a step in the right direction. And any step forward is better than a step backwards. That's all I have got to say.

MS. PASTOR: I guess we can take that as public comment. Do you want to go into comments, or do we have questions? Question? Question? We'll answer a couple more questions, and then try to make it to the official comment portion. Who hasn't had a chance to ask questions who wanted to? Step right up.

MS. ANDRIA: I wondered if you could enlighten us as to what the City's current position is on the cleanup? In the beginning, they said they didn't want there to be any cleanup; that they just wanted the houses to be cleared, and to be concreted over. Then they said there was no problem; that the kids didn't have a problem, and they decided on the health study. Now they are talking about paint causing the problem. But yet, I don't see the City Council enacting any kind of program to make landlords remove lead paint. And I was just wondering, really, as a citizen, we get no news in the newspaper about it. We hear nothing. Everything that is done on this subject in the City Council is done behind closed doors. So I was wondering, instead of being able to ask our City, if you could enlighten us as to what their position is?

MS. PASTOR: Before we answer that, for

the court reporter, state your name and spell it for her.

MS. ANDRIA: Kathy, K-A-T-H-Y, A-N-D-R-I-A.

MR. BRADLEY: To answer your question, I really can't speak for the City. The comment that you are referring to about knocking down houses and concreting over, that did exist. I don't know if those were the exact words from the former Mayor. Mayor Cruse did submit a comment that stated that all of the houses in the 1,000 parts per million plus zone should be razed, or should be rezoned. And it was an official comment from your City. And as far as current plans, only they can really speak to that.

MS. ANDRIA: Would any of them care to address the question?

MS. PASTOR: Would any?

MS. ANDRIA: There are several aldermen here. The Mayor has spoken. I just wondered if they could answer the question.

MS. PASTOR: If they would like to, they may.

MR. SELPH: I'm not sure I can answer your whole question, Kathy, because I think that what

part of the problem is, I think there is a misunderstanding among a lot of people here thinking there is some conspiracy keeping your yard from being cleaned up. That's certainly not my intention. My concern, which has always been a number one concern, is I want to ask this as a question: Can you guarantee us that after you clean and remove the Taracorp pile that those yards that are being cleaned up right now, and have been cleaned up, will not be recontaminated?

MR. BRADLEY: Actually, that's -- I have heard different reasons. I guess that's the current statement.

MR. SELPH: That's the current question I am asking you.

MR. BRADLEY: I can guarantee that, or we wouldn't do it. I will give you a really good reason not to remove the Taracorp pile, a bunch of the dust blowing in the air with lead from it impacting people, not only if you can put enough dust in the air to recontaminate yards back over 500 parts per million in a briefer period of time that would take to take out the pile, then obviously those dust levels are too high for people to breathe, as well. We wouldn't do it.

we will not do it if we can't control the dust. We don't know the answer to that now. We have not proposed removing the pile.

MR. GELPH: We're waiting for you to find that answer out. Now, I think that's part of the concern. Here we've got a monstrous pile sitting just two blocks from one of these people's home that is leaching into the ground water. That is still blowing dust. It's not being continually wetted down. It's still potentially recontaminating these yards. Those are some of the concerns that I have for the pile. I'm certainly not against cleaning it up, if those yards are over those parts per million, or that they can justifiably state need cleaning up. I'm certainly not going to stand in the way. I think we should put the horse in front of the cart.

MS. ANDRIA: But the contention that it's contaminated from lead paint? Why don't you empower the City to --

MR. GELPH: Who said it's contaminated? We can't find that information out.

MS. ANDRIA: I have thought from what I heard, the City was claiming, or Mr. Tarpotr, Alderman Tarpotr was claiming --

MR. SELPH: There is a lot of questions still out there about the lead paint and what effect it has. Certainly, we're finding older homes, especially in the neighborhoods that we are talking about that are over 60 years old, that were lead-painted homes. If they are not kept up continually, there is potential for the kids getting, ingesting those leads, getting that in their blood. They haven't addressed that.

MS. ANDRIA: They don't do that. That's not -- I mean, the Superfund was set --

MR. SELPH: They still get in the blood from the kids -- still saying they have high levels. If they don't address that, how in the world are we going to determine that?

MS. RISOENGER: Paint removal? I have got mine right here, if anybody would like to look at them.

MS. ANDRIA: I think Alderman Tarpoff was going to answer my question.

MR. TARPOFF: Okay. As stated, the objective of EPA is to -- This is not only what we heard, too. Also, from the new soil lead directive in July of this year from Washington that their objective

is to remediate and protect 95 percent of the children living in the area from having blood leads over 10. The City contends that this is not attainable with the plan that the EPA is making. In other parts of the country, the EPA and industry is successfully negotiating to do multi-media exposure cleanup in areas like Granite City where established cleanup levels, not just for soil, but for exterior paint, for interior paint, for contaminated water supplies. That's what the City is hoping to do. We are at a position where we can, because everything is reopened, negotiate, or attempt to get PRP's and EPA to reevaluate the cleanup so that the homes that are impacted with lead paint, interior and exteriorally -- And health studies identified that over 70 percent of the homes that were tested had high lead outside and inside -- Some of you were there -- don't have lead. I know you have lead outside. You were forced to clean it up.

MS. RISOENGER: That's right. I did at my expense, not EPA's expense.

MR. TARPOFF: $10,000 cleanup you would have been describing.

MS. RISOEGNER: I own the home, it's my

expense.

MS. ANDRIA: Alderman Tarpoff, a question on that. You are saying that negotiating with the PRP's to do this, to get the paint cleaned up right now. The question is addressed as soil. What guarantee do you have that come down the line PRP's are not going to turn against the City? Right now, you're allies. Excuse me. Somebody is paying for it. Granite City doesn't have the funds, I don't think, to pay for all of the legal work that's being done on a lawsuit like this. There is a study that's being performed, and an environmental group was hired, and I mean, is that coming out of the City treasury?

MR. TARPOFF: All of the city's attorney staff is paid for the City. They are not salaried. They are salaried. They agreed to defend the City in all litigation.

MS. ANDRIA: Are they preparing all the paperwork, or they doing all of the City's work?

MR. TARPOFF: With assistance, to the best of my knowledge, yes.

MS. ANDRIA: With assistance from PRP's attorneys?

MR. TARPOFF: There may have been some

joint work, assistance from myself, and research from others. But --

MS. ANDRIA: Do you have a cost estimate as to how much this has cost the citizens of this City to fight a cleanup the citizens consider correct?

MR. TARPOFF: The cost is no more than the City to the citizens than had this not occurred. The City attorney staff was to be paid $85,000 a year to cover all litigation in the City.

MS. ANDRIA: They are able to cover everything else that needs to be covered?

MR. TARPOFF: Yes.

MS. ANDRIA: How many attorneys do we have now? We didn't used to have that many attorneys.

MR. TARPOFF: We've had four attorneys in the City for as long as I know.

MS. ANDRIA: I remember I was involved in this -- I need to go back to questions. I don't want to get personal. Do you have an estimate as to this cost? What is the study costing the City that you are asking?

MR. TARPOFF: The cost is -- The PRP has been funding.

MS. ANDRIA: Do you have any -- The same

case that you made about the cleaning up the soils, the dust gets in the way. Do you not think they can turn around and use that on you when it's time to clean up the pile? I mean every argument that you made against removing, having trucks in the street, having dust flying around, and all, you can have that PRP turn around and use that on the City, and the City is going to be --

MR. TARPOFF: I am aware of that. The fact remains, you know, the mayor addressed the pile. The pile is sprayed with something that is supposed to be 75 percent effective in reducing foreign dust. Right in front of the pile is BV&G Trucking, which tests as high as 50,000 parts per million. There are no controls on that lot every day. How many trucks drive by your lot from that?

MS. ANDRIA: If it's just the truck route, I will be happy as can be.

MR. TARPOFF: Every day the trucks drive up and down State Street, and families question it. What is the EPA going to do with BV&G?

MR. BRADLEY: Tom, was that sprayed?

MR. BLOODWORTH: Yes.

MR. BRADLEY: When was that sprayed?

MR. BLOOMWORTH: Two weeks ago.

MR. TARPOFF: Sprayed with what?

MR. BRADLEY: Was it calcium chloride?

MR. BLOOMWORTH: Un-huh.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, it was. We agreed that with at least two trucking lots, clearly is not the pile that is biggest problem around there. Although, it seems to be what people like to talk about. Certainly, it is an eyesore, if nothing else. But BV&G Transport's lot, and the one that's immediately north of 1408 State Street, are probably a much greater source of potential recontamination of yards we've cleaned up. Then the pile, we've already taken a step by spraying the BV&G Transport property. Ultimately, we'll be cleaning that up. But until then, we plan to control the dust. Well, I guess we are working on getting the other lots sprayed.

MR. BLOOMWORTH: It's been sprayed.

MR. BRADLEY: We've sprayed it. We appreciate that point was brought up. We are addressing it.

MR. TARPOFF: How many times has it been sprayed? Is that the first time it's ever been sprayed?

MR. BLOODWORTH: Yes.

MR. BRADLEY: The first time we ever sprayed it. I don't think anyone else did. Just to sort of answer, the Mayor did not really ask the question, but basically we disagree that removing the pile is going to cause this gross recontamination. If it would, we wouldn't do it. It's a simple answer.

MR. TARPOFF: Whetehr it's capped or removed, heavy equipment will be on the pile. If you cap it, you are going to have heavy equipment on top of that pile?

MR. BRADLEY: That's right. And if it's a question of how much is it going to cost, it's not a question of if we can control it. We can build a garage around that pile. I have no idea how expensive that would be. We can enter that from only one end, and remove that pile, use wetting techniques. And I am sure we can control the dust with acceptable **levels.** But we don't know how much that is going to **cost.** It's not a question of if we can do it. It's if we can't, we wouldn't. It's how much is it going to cost, and is it worth spending all of that extra money. That's what we are still trying to determine. We will propose a remedy for the pile in 1995, and I

don't really know what it will be right now. Capping is still one possibility, and removing the pile is another. So that's really the answer. If we can't, we wouldn't. But I think we certainly can. It's just -- it's going to cost a lot of money to control that dust to insure that dust can be controlled.

MS. ANDRIA: I just want to finish that one question with Craig. Are you -- I'm even more confused now than ever. You don't want them to take away the pile, either, because that's going to cause dust?

MR. TARPOFF: No. If it can be done, definitely. I don't think there is anybody that likes that pile being there. Then we all want it gone.

MS. ANDRIA: So house paint comes first?

MR. TARPOFF: Wait a minute.

MS. ANDRIA: Does the house paint come first, then the pile?

MR. TARPOFF: I would think that without addressing the source of recontamination, which includes exterior paint, the pile, one way or the other, capping or removing, there is still going to be heavy equipment involved. Okay.

Studies on recontamination that are being

done currently around the country seem to indicate there is tremendously quick recontamination in urban settings. In Baltimore, for example, they have found as high as 100 parts per million recontamination in a year. That's phenomenal. They don't have a pile. They have got an old urban site.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: I am not certain that Baltimore is relevant, Craig, because in Baltimore, we did isolated properties, and there was no one major source or lead. And none of the sources were controlled. So I don't think that the recontamination in Baltimore has any relevance to the recontamination of Granite City. If it does, I think you are going to have to tell me why you think so.

MS. PASTOR: Let's give someone else a chance. You in the red shirt, sir.

I'd just like to clarity a point here. People have been talking about PRP. In case you don't know what that is, that means Potentially Responsible Party. That would be anybody who typically owned, operated, generated, or brought waste to a Superfund site. And they're all equally liable under the Superfund process. We have many PRP's involved in this site. So I just wanted to clarity that so you

know what that means.

MR. GALLIER: I have two questions for you.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Your name, sir?

MR. GALLIER: John Gallier, G-A-L-L-I-E-R. I want to know what is the long-term health effects on us that may have been exposed later on in life?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: On adults?

MR. GALLIER: Right.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Well, as you know, lead, when it is retained in the body is retained in your bones. When I showed the little diagram I showed there were two kinds of bone; one is deep bone, and one is shallow bone. In general, if your exposure were to stop, most of the lead in your body would be in the deep bone. As you start new bone, the lead in the deep bone would be somewhat encapsulated; it would no longer be available to go back into your body. So your exposure would stop. And unless there was some way, perhaps during aging when you start to lose bone mass, when that lead could possibly be released, you wouldn't see any health effects. If you are continually exposed as an adult, the health effects

are hypertension, which is high blood pressure. We see --

MR. GALLIER: What about neurological?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: -- infertility in men. And the neurological effects that we worry about are primarily in children, because learning deficits, attention span deficits, language problems, and women who are pregnant. During pregnancy, the calcium in bone is released. The lead is released along with the calcium, then transferred to the newborn child. So a baby can be born with a high lead level. It also causes low birth weight.

MR. GALLIER: What about other forms of cancer of the blood?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: We really have not evaluated the cancer, carcinogen of blood. Though, it's suspected that lead is a carcinogen. But because the other effects are so pronounced, we have based most of our evaluation of those effects. Those are more likely to occur. With cancer, that would be a very low probability.

MR. GALLIER: For Brad, on the cleanup of the pile, what is wrong with the saving to the taxpayer, why can't you utilize the town's army depot,

and have those guys instead of standing around polishing equipment, bring them down here, and put a rail spur in between the piles and a couple big soldiers at the depot to load it up in a couple weeks, and the railroad would haul that garbage as a bonus or 20 to 30 below their cost, just to keep the rail cars moving from one part of the coast to the other to keep their car pool in balance, and dump it on a military base, and bury it in an artillery field.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, I really can't give a straight answer to that, because I am not sure anyone would want to receive that, all of the liability that it would bring with it. But, you know, rail travel is certainly something that has been considered with respect to possible removal of the pile. It may be a cost-saving measure.

One thing I'd like to clear up, with respect to the debate that we've had here about removing the pile, or removing the site. It's not a question of really whether EPA addresses the pile. Yes, we will. We don't know if we will be recapping or removing it at this point. We really need to have more information before we make a decision on that. But what EPA is saying, the priorities is the yards,

because if you look at how children can be impacted, they are actual playing in yards. They have had blood studies down here that shows that many children are over the 10 milligrams per decaliter blood lead levels, which is considered a level or concern.

With respect to the pile, how can a pile get to children. Well, they can get on the pile, but how the smaller children, which are the real interest, get the lead? They wouldn't be able to climb that fence too easily. We really don't see any evidence of that. So the pile is fully fenced. So the direct contact route is hard to, you know, envision some small child doing that.

Another route or the exposure is ground water. The present water that is contaminated, nobody drinks it. That's not to say we will not address the pile. It's just to say that pathway is not complete. So there is really no exposure there in children.

The third way is dust. Yes, even though it's sprayed, there is probably some dust that comes off that pile. These are facts in itself is related to EPA are some percentage or effectiveness, but the air monitors in the area, which used to read somewhere around four times the lead standard for air back

before the smelter was shut down, currently read a small fraction on it, 1.15 micrograms per cubic meter, the standard for lead in air. What we are saying, as far as the impact on children, it's clear to us that the yards have to go first. That is not to say we won't address the pile.

MS. PASTOR: Question? Come on down.

MS. RISOENGER: Are the records -- Were they originally contaminated by the pile or lead smelter, does anybody know?

MR. BRADLEY: The answer to that would be both. Obviously, the smelter operated over many years, and caused a lot of the deposits into the yards. There was a rather dirty period of operation on the pile, too, when St. Louis Lead Recyclers attempted to recycle part of that pile. And people who lived there at the time said there was dust scraps flying around. They were trying to recover lead from it. I would say the majority of it came from the smelter stack, but the pile certainly had --

MR. TARPOFF: Okay. But you're talking about when somebody was up there moving the pile around, not when it was setting idle; correct?

MR. BRADLEY: That's correct.

MS. RIOSEWGER: Okay. I have a question for the City, because I think you guys are being misrepresentative about it, and correct me if I'm wrong, okay. This is what I thought you said. Who is paying for the environmental firm to come out to test in the homes for the people whose homes were already cleaned up, and that are being cleaned up now?

MR. FITZHENRY: I have advised the mayor and the aldermen not to make any more comments, or answer any more questions directed to the City. The purpose of this meeting is to ask questions of the U.S. EPA. These people, some of them won't be here after tonight. The Mayor, Craig, myself, we'd be happy to stay afterwards and answer questions.

MS. RIOSEWGER: The other thing is, have you run into a lot of opposition on the 1400 blocks of State, Grand, and the odd side of Madison Avenue, them saying they don't want their yards cleaned up? That's fine. Okay. I am not going to go out there and say I think everybody should do what I believe is right. Okay. But does the majority of the people want their yards cleaned up, or not want their yards cleaned up? Or are the majority of the people concerned about the pile, or not concerned about the pile in the 1400

blocks of State, Grand, and the odd side of Madison Avenue, that you have talked to?

MR. BRADLEY: Absolutely, the majority of the people want their yards cleaned up in that area. I would say, as a veteran of probably 400 visits to various people's doors throughout the last four or five years, you get access to sample the yards first. They did clean them up. The majority of the people in the shaded cleanup areas I showed earlier would like their yard cleaned up.

And as far as the pile, I would say the majority are also concerned about the pile. I don't get many statements, though, about, 'You have got to do the pile first.' I think people want the yards cleaned up, in general; and they also want the pile out of town. I don't get -- There is really not too many who say the pile first or the yard first. That doesn't really come up very often.

MS. RISOENGER: To your knowledge, has anybody ever seen any kids playing over in that pile, to your knowledge?

MR. BRADLEY: Not to my knowledge, no.

MS. RISOENGER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TINKER: My name is Stephanie Tinker.

I'd just like to ask Mr. Bradley, because we have spoken many times in the last two years, I was under the assumption that the Taracorp pile was fenced in; correct?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, that's correct.

MS. TINKER: Did you not tell me that, I believe it was just last month at the court hearing in Benton, Illinois, the pile is fenced in? So if any children are getting to that pile, I would think that would be the parent's problem, and not the City's problem, or the EPA's problem. That's just, you know, my feeling on that. Everybody keeps coming up about this pile, and I just wanted to make sure I was right on that, that the pile is fenced in, and it's very hard to get to. So if there is anybody in there, they are trespassing?

MR. BRADLEY: That would be correct. The only evidence we've ever seen or any visitation on any part of the main industrial areas is where we've seen some beer cans over on the black hard rubber pile, on the -- over on the trust property, just to the south. Hopefully, that's not the seven and younger crowd that's doing that

MS. TINKER: Yeah, hopefully. I just

wanted to make that clear for some people, because like I said, when you and I had spoken, I was under the assumption that it was fenced in, and that there was an air monitor at all times?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, the air monitor is operated by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, and is located immediately adjacent to the pile. But, yes, they are operated at all times.

MS. TINKER: Thank you.

MS. PASTOR: I had a hand over here for a question. I thought I saw it out of the corner of my eye. No questions? Question? Question? Question?

MR. MCDUELL: Dan McDuell. I live at 2237 Edison. I was just wondering if you could tell me what the proposed cost of the cleanup is going to be?

MR. BRADLEY: Okay. The proposed cost has a rather large span in it, because we have an estimate of about $22 million that was given to us by the contractor that is working on looking at the pile again, and what we do with the ground water. However, the Army Corps of Engineers personnel have estimated that higher, because if we keep getting started up and shut down like we've been doing, we will lose a lot of

the efficiency, and it is conceivable that will be a little higher. To-date, we have been started up and shut down a few times. So, it's just not what we want to be doing. So the estimate -- That is sort of the way things should work, is about $22 million. And it will go higher, if we can continue to do this right.

MR. TARPOFF: That's for residential, all the residential cleanup, $22 million?

MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, that's correct.

MR. TARPOFF: As far as the pile itself is concerned, my understanding was that you were to give the judge an answer as to what you might be planning to do with the pile sometime this month. Are you now saying it's not going to happen until next year?

MR. BRADLEY: I didn't recall that personally that we had an obligation to give the judge an answer this month. What we are saying is for the pile we have some uncertainty regarding what is the density of the pile, and also can we control the dust, if it were to be removed. We have to get answers to those questions before we can realize whether it's even going to be successful or not. In the case of the dust, what is it really going to cost? In the

case of the density, now that affects the cost estimates, is that the land fill, if you take the pile out it's going to have to end up in a land fill. They accept waste on the basis of the tons. We know it's about 85,000 cubic yards, but the denisty, cubic yardage into the tons, NL Industries estimated that at 2.94, which brought it up to roughly 250,000 ton estimate that we've seen in the previous documents. However, during a pilot study that we've conducted to see whether or not it would be successfully stabalized, the density was clear for 1.55. Now we need to figure out where in that range the denisty really is. We need to take some real tests, because we clearly have a discrepancy in the denisty estimates of people who eyeballed it, or, you know, looked at a small portion of the pile, and tried to determine density. What that translates to is roughly a $7 million dollar cost difference, if you use 1.55 versus 2.94. We need to clear that up, and also understand whether we can do the dust levels under the standard and not recontaminate, or I guess, the main thing is keep the dust level within the standard. We don't know the answer to that yet.

When we did the pilot study for

solidification of that pile, there was some real high dust levels. They were higher than we want to see, and we need to see whether we can do something a little different without a greatly added cost and still be effective in controlling the dust. And that's why we are not prepared to go forward with what we will do with the Taracorp pile.

Then with respect to the ground water, it's really impacted by what did we do with the pile. If we take the pile out, there is really no source left for the ground water. If we leave it, we still have the source there. So the ground water remedy is dependent on the pile. So until we get our cost estimates together, and the likelihood of success of that from a dust standpoint, we can't go forward on the pile or the --

MR. TARPOFF: When do you think you will have those?

MR. BRADLEY: What we put in the fact sheet was 1995. I'd really be happier if there were much sooner than later in 1995. We are currently going to start some pilot studies to determine those, the answers to those questions. And when we are done, we will review them, come out with a proposed plan for

what we will do with the pile and ground water remaining, or for the removal of the fill areas, as well.

MS. PASTOR: Anymore questions? Are we ready to do comments? I know people came in and told me that they wanted to make a comment. If you want to come up with a question, okay. Sure. Go ahead.

MR. GALEYEA: My name is Steve Galeyea. Are you deciding on what, with regard to the cleanup, on a yard by yard basis, based on the tests that were run? In other words, the 500 parts per million or not?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes. There is really two parts to that answer. The first one is if people allowed their yard to be tested, yes, that is what we based it on. If they did not allow their yard to be tested, then we'll have to use statistical methods to determine the likelihood of a yard over 500 parts per million. In almost all cases, it would be more likely to cleaned up if they didn't have their yard tested, than if they did.

MR. GALEYEA: Mine tested out on that 500. So maybe my neighbor's would be be over?

MR. BRADLEY: There is lot of the

variability between yards, depending on whether clean soil was brought in, and other factors. And what we've found is that number, 1,600 hundred residences before based on -- We were able to sample about 1,000 of those 1,000 yards. We feel that about 300 of them are going to be cleaned. So it really boils down to about 1,300 yards. We feel really the 500 parts per million cleanup level is best. Thank you.

MS. PASTOR: Anymore questions? One more question.

MR. GUY: I'd like to know how you have protected in the course here, how did EPA determine that the 500 parts per million is an acceptable level?

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Can we get your name first?

MR. GUY: Sorry. Mark Guy, G-U-Y.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Mark, were you here when I gave the presentation on the model?

MR. GUY: No. I'm sorry, I wasn't.

MS. VANLEEUWEN: Okay. I explained that EPA has a tool called the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model, and it's a predicted model that uses all of the data from the individual yards, and looks at the possibility that a child could have a blood

lead level greater than 10 micrograms per deciliter. After we've looked at a couple, we look at all those individual yards, we look at our defaults in that model to see whether the defaults that would be used are appropriate. And if they are not, then we change the defaults, using the site-specific data we have. And we then run the model at different soil cleanup levels to see what level would give 95 percent of the children predicted blood lead levels less then 10 micrograms per deciliter. And we looked at a number of different numbers for the soil to house dust ratio. We call it a sensitivity analysis, and we determined that a soil clean up level in the range of 450 to 500 would give us protection for the children in the area.

Now, the report that describes this is in the Administrative Record in the library. And it's a report by Allen Marcus. It's a preliminary report. It will be expanded upon. There is also a copy of the guidance manual for the Integrated Uptake Biokinetic Model, which explains a little bit more about how the model works.

MS. PASTOR: Okay. Any more questions? We've exhausted the questions? Ready for commments?

MR. HELNER: John Helner, 1707 Delmar.

Two or three months ago, I was driving by State Street there. They had green looking dirt that they was processing or something. Now, did they get all that cleaned up, and are they still going to do anything like that, or --

MR. BRADLEY: You are talking about on the property with the black rubber pile behind it; right?

MR. MELNER: Yeah.

MR. BRADLEY: What that was was the solidification of the battery chips that we were bringing in from Venice and Eagle Park Acres, and the areas we were cleaning up. The idea was we were formerly shipping those out to a Peoria land fill, and we had a rather large distance to cover on transportation. They just solidified it at the door anyway. They were doing what we were doing in Peoria, and charging a premium for that. So what we did was, as we got along in the battery chips, and stabalized it on-site. That's what you saw. That was making it so that it would not leach lead in unacceptable levels so we could then take it to a land fill much closer for a much cheaper price. And the green, the reason there was green, was that the rains were out. There

was not -- After it was stabalized and treated, there was not a shelter over that. So if we had a large rain fall event, it could potentially wash some of that away. We had a berm structure built around that to capture the water. But we're not taking any chances. So the green stuff was something to stop that from getting wet and washing away. Basically, making the water just roll off without picking up the solid material. And, yes, that was all taken back. If you go by there now, you'll just see the empty pad is all there is left. All that was taken to the land fill. We took all the equipment out that was used to do that process. It's gone.

MR. MELNER: Okay. They also mentioned the contamination by the trucking firm?

MR. BRADLEY: BV&G?

MR. MELNER: Yeah. Is that still in operation? Is that still -- They coated the area, like I said. How long will that place be closed?

MR. BRADLEY: That's two different things. You're talking about something other than the green? You're talking about the dust particles. I don't know exactly how long it will last. What we will do is consult with the manufacturer. And yes,

the trucking line is in use. That will certainly make is so it won't last as long. Whenever it needs to be released, we haven't figured out how long it will last. Then we will reevaluate so we don't get the big clouds of the dust going around. Eventually, that area needs to be cleaned up. That's part of the main industrial area.

MR. MELNER: Does that particular trucking firm have any contamination from the pile going on, or is it just from the -- on the ground that's already there?

MR. BRADLEY: Well, the trucking firm has received contamination from the pile, received contamination from the smelter stack by being so close. I know some of it has crept little, a fine line to the trucking firm. There are a few pieces of battery case material that has fallen through the fence in a few spots, and the trucks turn in and out of there. Some of that has been moved around a little bit. You will find some pieces of battery casing on the trucking lot. It has been impacted by the pile and smelter. Alderman Tarport mentioned the lead levels in some spots in that trucking lot are fairly high. That's why we need to address that.

MR. MELNER: Will you get to that as soon as possible, or get to that first?

MR. BRADLEY: As far as controlling the dust, yes, as far as doing that before --

MR. MELNER: Trying to find out?

MR BRADLEY: Before we do the yards? That's sort of a toss-up. We're currently planning to, when we are able to do more yards, other than the 17 we are doing within a small area, we would like to go to 1600 and 1700 Cleveland, Edison, Delmar. They also have much higher lead concentration. Then at that point, we may go and try to do something with that trucking line. Remember, there is another trucking line across the street, a little bit south, that we also have to look at.

MR. MELNER: Is that because the air blows that way, the wind blows that way that they have more contamination in that area?

MR. BRADLEY: It's not really that. It is just the trucking line's activity of having the trucks turn in and out of there kicks up dust. So far, neither of them are paved.

MR. MELNER: Another question is about the grassy areas in between the yard and the sidewalk,

and sidewalk and curb. I have seen that you guys have already dug up some yards in the 1500 block of Grand. Is it -- Did you get the okay from the City to go ahead and do these areas?

MR. BRADLEY: We got the okay. We've got a court agreement from the city to cleanup the easement, which is what you're talking about, between the curb and sidewalk only on ones we are currently cleaning; not the ones we've already cleaned up. It is the 17 we are doing now, not the ones we did previously, no.

MR. MELNER: I though you said they said no. He said yes? You got the okay?

MR. BRADLEY: Just for those 17. We don't -- All we have, other than that, is a written response that says no.

MR. MELNER: Okay. Well, we need to find out if the City is going to let you do the rest of them. I think it would be good if they just went ahead and let you do the whole thing at one time. That way you don't have to come back and do it again. And, you know, it's just one of those things you need to take care of all at one time. Like I say, that's just about it, unless you get it all done within a

reasonable time. But I don't see anything the City should gripe about it. You know, you do a good job trying to get it cleaned up. You know, they shouldn't gripe too much for you guys trying to clean up just somebody else's mess. They do nothing.

MR. BRADLEY: I couldn't agree with you more.

MS. PASTOR: That sounded like a comment to me. We'll take that as a public comment. And if you have more questions, we can come back to that. Let's have statements, comments, opinions, thoughts, one way or the other. If it is in statement form, and if you have questions afterwards, we'll stay and talk with you after, and answer more questions. If you didn't understand something, we will go over it with you on our maps, overheads, a little bit of that.

But again, we have our first comment. All of them will follow. Again, you will need to tell the court reporter your name, and spell it for her so she can get that for the record. Sir, right here in front.

MR. MORRIS: Milton Morris, M-O-R-R-I-S. I own the Millpower Manufacturing Company in Venice, fabricating. An inspector came along the avenue and

marked it all off. So a few months ago, they came up with a frontloader, big bucket machine, big trucks, and they went in the yard, the alley across from it. I was looking out the window to my office. And the bucket started up at the curb. There was a little bit of black dust first, which was part of the street, and then a yard, all sand, and they loaded two truckloads of sand. And then they strung tape around, because there is a hole there now. About two weeks later, they came and brought two truck loads of rock. I was glad to see that, because they filled up her hole they had dug in her yard were there was no contamination at all. The rest of the rock was used on what was left from the alley to street, which I thanked them for, because the City never could fix up that street. So in one way, the EPA done a real good thing for me. I thank you for it.

I don't know whether you know it or not, but Missouri is the lead headquarters in the whole country. In the early days, before highways were built, there was wagons, and horses, and things coming up here into Kansas, and the mountain towns in the area. One was called Devil's Tollgate, where the wagons couldn't go straight through and started -- The

wagons would have to move, have to move the back end of the wagon so they could go through. Come up from the south, Mexico to Missouri for lead. I don't want you to clean up Missouri, because their lead is there. I'd hate to see you go down there and try to clean up all that lead. That's where it comes from.

In the early days of these houses they talked about, the inspectors, or the houses consisted of lead pipe. And to wipe a joint, it was quite a work of art. And I remember a friend of mine, his house was -- He built a house out by Wilson Park. He had to put in lead pipe, and you talk about lead in the house. It's not only paint. I'm glad you don't put lead paint in anymore, but there is awful lead in paint, like there is asbestos, and they're trying to get rid of that.

And I feel very strongly that the pile should be removed. I am not too enthused about the yards. I would be more enthused about the EPA inspecting the houses, with permission to inspect the houses, and if there was any lead pipe in that house, take it out, and help the people that way.

Now, when this thing first started particularly, financially it was $30 million they were

going to use. National Lead -- I happen to know the chief engineer of National Lead, and I think the headquarters is in New Jersey, and he is afraid that you are going to sue National Lead. Or if you tried, I think that you're going to have a fight on your hands, because the lead pile -- I go to all of these hearings. I am a nut about hearings. I went to the hearing when they were going to put a hazardous plant, bring hazardous waste into Granite City, and I objected, spoke against that. I did not want to have hazardous material on the highway. Granite City Steel had, through Granite City, with a lot of coils, acid. I don't want that truck to have any problems getting to a hazardous plant. I did that for the hazardous plant. I thank God for that.

So if we are going to do anything at all, let's work on houses, talk about lead paint. I can understand lead paint was so good it could last for 50, 60 years, inside and out. Plumbing is very important, because of the water running through there, the plumbing; you drink the water. Now, I went to a hearing in City Hall. I think that was one of the last ones you had here, and I forget who the man was. I want to know who the man was that -- He was more of

an engineering person, and anyhow they introduced me to him. I said we should speak privately. So we was in the City Council room, and we went over -- I said, 'Now, if I get a piece of bakelite -- ' Bakelite is a plastic material, lead. All the companies there was not putting lead in the piles deliberately. They were putting a lot of the plastic in the pile, probably 60, 70 percent of that pile was black bakelite. And you research bakelite. You can burn it. Give it to Illinois Power so our rates will come down, and the rest of it would go to land fill. And I don't mean a land fill in the Granite City area. I mean away from here, like Collinsville would be a good place for it. They don't have lead over there. But I asked this engineer, I said, 'If I get a piece of bakelite, I am going to surround it with lead powder, and I am going to put pressure on it for 50 years. Would that piece of bakelite be contaminated?' He said, 'No.' I said, 'Well, then, why don't you give a local company the contract to take that pile, keep the air off it, and watch it. Watch it.' If you get 60 to 70 percent of bakelite in that pile, it'll be relatively small percentage have to work the land fill. The land fill would not be dust. It would be wet, most likely. So

this is the thing I think that happens, the houses should be looked at. The people in houses spend all of this money helping clean houses, do their house. So the house itself is perfect. The yard, if they want to clean it up, fine. Don't come around my shop and do anymore of that stuff. That was an absolute waste, eight men there for two days, two weeks apart. That was wasted, just plain waste. I don't like that, because in the long run, I am going to have to help pay for it. I don't think National Lead should be penalized for this, because Granite City Steel is not penalized for the dump that they have got sitting there, a bigger one than that. But I say the pile should be moved. It's an eyesore right in the middle of an industrial area. If I was going to build a plant, I wouldn't build it in that neighborhood; not because I worry about lead, because I don't like to have a big factory close to an eyesore like that. I think it can be moved. I think it can treated so that you don't have dust problems. You can't go in there with a bulldozer, or a pickup, and load a truck and haul it to a land fill? You can't do that? You're going to have to process it while you are doing it, separate it so you don't have so much to take to the

land fill. Sell the Baklite, sell it, recycle it. It's plastic. Or sell it, give it to Illinois Power so they can cut our rates. That would be a good idea. Thank you very much.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you for that comment.

MS. ANDRIA: My name is Kathy Andria. I am president of the Lincoln Homeowners' Association. We came into existence, by the way, when the City tried to rezone half of Lincoln Place into an industrial area. There are some in the City who think that is what this is all about. Lincoln Place is located in the cleanup area, and many of our members will be affected by your decision. And I have been asked to voice some of their concerns.

The City claims there is no problem with lead, and cites the results of the IDPH health study. We think there are big problems with it. In one block of Lincoln, initially five families had inaccurate or confusing results. One family, in which a child tested high for lead, was given house results for someone else's house. Another family had tested four times, and never did get a result. One elderly woman, who had lived in her house for some 50 years, had her entire file disappear. Yet when the results were

published, it looked like a very scientific study. When these points were brought up at a public meeting to discuss the health study, they were never addressed, nor were they included in the comments, I understand, from talking to you last night.

We also feel that the study was flawed in its very premise. The study indicated that the children who were tested were currently being exposed to lead. Well, I am sure this was true for some families. The overwhelming majority of families in Granite City were very aware of the lead problem for a long time before the health study started. We conducted very aggressive campaigns to inform parents of the dangers of lead the entire year before the study began. We passed out fliers telling parents not to let their children play in the dirt, to wash their toys, keep their hands washed; and we instructed them to feed them calcium to counter the effects from lead. There were also articles in the local paper to that effect.

In addition, I had arranged for testing at the Lincoln Place Community Center that year. It was done by the visiting nurse from Family Services of Alton, and they too handed out literature and

counseled families. So when the health studies, IDPH health study, started a year later, most caring parents were already keeping their children out of the soil. I stated this fact at the public meeting following the health study, and said I felt that the study was flawed because of it. Tom Long of IDPH denied that there had been any public information prior to the study. Although, IDPH had also given out information that was published in the local paper. It has always been my assumption that if the premise is incorrect, your results will likely be incorrect. If the City succeeds in stopping the cleanup, will the parents think it's okay to let their kids play in the dirt? What about people who don't live here yet? What about property values? The area is currently decline because of contaminated soil. If the City succeeds, the EPA will go away; but those properties will still have contaminated soil. If the EPA is stopped from cleaning up the soil, I think it is safe to say the only winners are the PRP's. The citizens lose. The children lose. Those who want their yards cleaned, should have a right to have them cleaned, and at the level EPA credits safe, and do it now. At the rate this lawsuit is going, it could be years before

the pile is ever removed.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you.

MS. TINKER: My name is Stephanie Tinker, and I live at 1406 State in Granite City. This is just one short block from the Taracorp pile at 16th and Cleveland. Today, Wolff landscaped and laid the last of my sod in my newly excavated yards. I want to go on the record tonight to assure the officials from the EPA that OHM, who is doing the excavation, and that Wolff Landscaping are both doing a professional and efficient job at removing the lead contamination on the both sides of State and Grand Streets. I'm very involved and interested in this cleanup, because I have a two year old daughter. My elderly grandfather lives directly behind me on Grand, and we daily check on my parents who live two doors down from my grandfather, also on Grand. And I must tell you OHM has been working steadily on Grand Avenue, working on several homes at a time, using expert employees to supervise the cleanups, and always being professional and courteous. They help work with all residents, making sure there is clean and safe entrances into their homes, and that when they leave at night, all pieces of excavated dirt is covered properly and

safely and carted off, down and away from access to anyone. I want the City of Granite City to understand that the residents on the 1400 block of State and Grand are extremely pleased, and relieved that this excavation is being performed. I have had daily contact with both of these companies since the 3rd of October. Again, my opinion is this cleanup is being done in the best possible manner. My neighbors on these two blocks believe that clean yards is far more important. Before the cleanup, you want the Taracorp pile addressed. Most of us feel there is no potential danger from this. I feel, as the EPA regulates this pile -- That doesn't mean we don't feel that this pile should not be addressed. It just means that we feel that the residential homes and properties are the most important to deal with first.

My next comment actually addresses the position of the City of Granite City. We all know we live in an industrial city, and there are toxins released daily into our City. Why does the City want to fight the EPA in their effort to relieve our City of at least one toxin? We also don't understand why the City of Granite City hired an outside environmental agency to do separate testing on these

yards. We would also like to know where the City is getting the funds to pay this agency. We are supposedly in a budget crunch, but yet find money to pay for a study that most, if not all, of my have neighbors feel is a frivolous attempt of the City to once again put an end to this lead cleanup. Our biggest concern is our health, our children's health, and our property values.

Also, we feel that the properties that were cleaned up in 1993 and whose easements were not cleaned up deserve and must be cleaned up before their homes can be declared lead-free. If these easements were not cleaned up, too, this would mean our homes are not completely clean and free.

We'd also like to ask our City why they feel they have a right to put a stop to any improvement any homeowner wants to make to their property. We own our homes, and we feel we have the right to allow the United States Environmental Protection Agency access to our property to make our homes lead-free. So my question again is to the City or Granite City: Do our City officials feel they have a right to interfere with our private homeowner's rights to improve the values of the property, and to

protect the health of their families?

Also, I understand from the EPA that no discernable dust has been detected from the lead pile site in quite some time, and is continuing -- Sorry and S & S Contracting, what the city believes is being constantly monitored and watched, and is clearly a concern of the EPA who do intend to address this stack, this pile after the homes, which we feel all along that the EPA should be addressing after the health of the residents is dealt with. As far as dust contamination, what is the dust that falls daily from trucks that leave Granite City Steel mill? What is that pile at Granite City Steel mill located at 20th Street and 203? What are the smells we wake up to some beautiful mornings? Granite City is so concerned about dust contamination. I want to know the answer to these questions. I want to know if Granite City is so concerned about dust contamination why they aren't concerned about the extreme dust and smoke that the City's largest corporation spews daily into our City. Once more, our City is full of toxins. If the U.S. government wants to cleanup one of these toxins, why doesn't Granite City recognize the concern and desires of its residents and respect their wishes concerning

their homes and health.

I'd also like to let the City of Granite City know I don't know exactly who, but I spoke with Mr. Bradley earlier this afternoon, and we couldn't find it, but in the court document that I received from the Department of Justice, it says here that so long as the City and PRP's do not interfere with such actions, abide by such plans, protocols, and regulations, U.S. EPA will not exclude the City and PRP's from properties to which the City and PRP's have secured access, U.S. EPA will not advise homeowners as to whether or not they should agree to provide the City and PRP's with access to the properties, but the U.S. EPA expressely does not endorse any activities the City and PRP's may measure at such properties. That's my question. Once again, gentlemen from the City, and I notice the mayor is gone, but I would like to know why you are so adamant about not letting home property owners get their homes cleaned up when it's the government that is paying for it, not the City of Granite City. That's all I'd like to say.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you. Anyone else who hasn't had a chance, and maybe would like to come up and give us a comment? Yes, sir. Step right up.

MR. ANTHONY: I'm Mike Anthony. My 10 year old son lives at 1742 Maple Street in Granite City. That's the cleanup area. There are ten other children under the age of 10 who live on our block. While standing outside, the mayor and myself, and we were talking. We commented that when we were kids the safety level or lead was 25 or 18, we really didn't know. Now, we ring out it's 12 or 10 or 8, in some cases. Since new information comes in all the time, shouldn't we use the safest knowledge, the lowest level, rather than allow the level -- rather than use the level recommended by the winner of some debate? There seems to be a lot of debate going on. This is right. No, this is right. Take the lowest and go with that. You have to be better off.

Returning to the comment that the pile needs to be cleand up first, prior to any other cleanup. That will stop any further contamination from that source. That makes sense. You don't paint your ceiling the day after you put in new carpet. Let's use some basic common sense here. Clean the pile and the lot next to it, take care of the paint. The City Council can pass an ordinance for that right now. Then clean the yards. After all, it is the

yards that the children play in. The EPA's job is to project generations of children. Not cleaning the yards implies that there is no problem. If there is no problem, why is the pile being removed or capped, whichever eventually gets to be done? If there is no problem, why are we here? There is a problem. We all know that. Let's do the right thing. Clean up the pile, the truck company lot, the paint, the yards. Clean it all up right now. The people like to think of the swimmer who is drowning while the lifeguards stand around asking who has the authority to make him safe? Thank you.

MS. RISOENGER: My name is Chris Risoenger. I don't know, you know, what the City thinks. They don't live where we live there. Okay. We don't want to -- I don't want to sound like I'm unconcerned about that pile. My six and eight year old kids do not play in that pile. Okay. They play in my yard daily. I love my children. I want to do whatever it takes, and whatever is in my power to protect my children. I have heard reports of children playing in piles that they were cleaning up over in the 1600 block of State, Grand, Edison, somewhere, that there was children playing in those piles. I

would just like to know where are their parents? That is not the EPA's fault that these children were not being watched by their parents. Okay. It is not their fault. There is nothing you can do if a parent does not watch a child and keep them out of harm's way. My whole neighborhood is tore up. I have yet to see one child from my neighborhood in the 1400 block of State and Grand inside one of those orange, fenced areas playing on any dirt that was excavated out of those yards. It is the City -- I don't see why they are wanting to stop the homeowner's that want their yards cleaned up. They are -- I don't know if they are not listening to their residents, or if they don't know how many people are actually for this. But of those 17 homes that the EPA was granted permission to clean up, this is my understanding, and I have heard two different figures; I have heard three homes denied them access, and I heard five homes denied them access. But out of 17, what does it matter if three people don't want them cleaned up, or five people don't want them cleaned up, 12 did, or 15 did, and that will tell you right there that those people are outnumbered. Why don't the City let the EPA go ahead and finish what they have started with these

residential areas? Take their time to address that pile. We don't want the EPA to rush in and try to remove that pile in an unsafe manner that is going to recontaminate our yards. We want the EPA to take their time and figure out the most efficient and correct way to remove that pile without recontaminating our yards, without putting dust in the air, without affecting my children. My children are directly affected by that pile. But that pile doesn't concern me as much as my kids playing in a yard full of lead contaminated soil every day of their life for the last eight years and six years. It doesn't bother me that much. I can keep my kids out of that pile. Where am I supposed to send them out of their yard? Can I send them next door to my neighbor's contaminated yard? Should I send them to the 1400 block, to those contaminated yards over there? I don't think so. I am totally relieved that I would say 80 percent of my neighborhood is going to be cleaned up when this project is done in the 1400 block of State and Grand, because that's where my kids play, not in that pile.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you.

MS. TYLER: My name is Rhonda Tyler.

First of all, I'd like to say that I respect the EPA as experts in this area, and I didn't put in a written comment, but I seem to agree with the 500 parts per million cleanup. I don't understand the government, the Granite City government's position. This is the first time I have been involved with this, and from what I hear, it sounds like the people who choose to have their property cleaned up, and perhaps if the government had other questions about the pile, they could let the yard cleanup continue, and address the pile in a different manner. I'm living in Granite City, not in this area. I am a little appalled that we would expend any money fighting the EPA when there is a high school that looks like it's kind of falling down. So I guess a lot of my questions are to the government of Granite City, and not to the EPA. I would strongly agree with the EPA's position.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you. If there aren't any others questions or comments --

MR. HERMAN: Jerry Herman. There's been a lot of talk this evening about lead cleanup, some of it's been about paint cleanup. When did paint cleanup, when did lead begin in paint? When did that --

MS. TINKER: Twenty years ago.

MR. HERMAN: It was still there in the '70's?

MS. TINKER: That's over 20 years ago.

MR. HERMAN: The other thing is you are talking about cleaning up the lead in paint. How in the world are you going to get all of those houses cleaned up? It just isn't 1400, 1500, 1600 blocks. It goes all over. What percentage of homes are there that have to be cleaned up inside and out. That's just one of those things. But it's all over the United States. It not just here in Granite City. It's not just in this little area. So for me, I know a lot of the other people think the first thing we need is to get these yards cleaned up. We've got little kids that play in that stuff. I have had kids come up to me and ask, 'Where can I play in the dirt?' I'll tell them I don't want them playing in it. I'd rather they just don't play in the dirt at all. One said if he plays, where can he play? Well, if he does play over there, there in the dirt, they are going to eat the stuff one way or the other.

Also, I'd like to request that the Petition that was taken in September, this past

September, be included in the EPA's papers, if they would.

MR. SIEGEL: Good idea.

MS. PASTOR: Thank you for that comment. Okay. Do we have any other comments? Then we can close the comment portion of the meeting, and we'll stay around for a little while, and if you would like to come up and talk to us, or anyone else in the room that you have a question for, we will be happy to talk about it a little while one-on-one. Don't forget, if you didn't make a comment tonight, and you'd like to send one in, or jot one down, they are in the back of the room. Hand it to anyone with a name tag. We will be glad to take it. December 14 is when the comment period ends. Thank you for coming.

* * * * * *